DRAFT

ALAMO COLLEGES

# SWOT Analysis
# Priorities
# Competitive Factor Analysis

## 2012-13 Report

SPPE • Strategic Planning and Performance Excellence
(210) 485-0750 www.alamo.edu/planning

THE ALAMO WAY
ALWAYS INSPIRE. ALWAYS IMPROVE.

# SWOT Analysis, Priorities, Competitive Factor Analysis
## 2012-13 Report

# Table of Contents


| | Page |
|---|---|
| I. Executive Summary | 3 |
| II. SWOT Analysis | 6 |
| SWOT Analysis Results (Top 5) | 6 |
| SWOT Analysis Top Results by Stakeholder Category | 7 |
| SWOT Analysis Top Results by Campus | 8 |
| III. Priorities | 9 |
| Top Priorities for the Alamo Colleges by Stakeholder Category | 12 |
| Top Priorities for the Alamo Colleges by Campus | 13 |
| IV. Competitive Factor Analysis | 14 |
| Overall Competitive Factor Analysis Results | 14 |
| Competitive Factor Analysis Top Results by Stakeholder Category | 16 |
| Competitive Factor Analysis Top Results by Campus | 16 |
| V. Appendices | 17 |
| Appendix A. Sample of SWOT Analysis Survey | 18 |
| Appendix B. Frequency Distribution of Responses to SWOT Survey by Stakeholder Category | 25 |
| Appendix C. Frequency Distribution of Responses to SWOT Survey by Campus | 28 |
| Appendix D. Comments Provided by Responding Stakeholders | 31 |

# I. Executive Summary

This SWOT Analysis report presents the results of the Fall 2012 online survey on the Alamo Colleges' strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats. The report includes a list of priorities for the Alamo Colleges identified by survey respondents as well as a list of competitive factors related to area institutions of higher education. This information is provided prior to the Spring 2013 Alamo Colleges strategic planning retreat as a tool for the review, update, and reaffirmation of the strategic plan.

## The Survey

The online survey (sample in Appendix A) addressed the following areas:
*Strengths:* What are the top 3 things that the Alamo Colleges do well?
*Weaknesses*: What are the top 3 things that the Alamo Colleges should improve?
*Opportunities*: What opportunities could the Alamo Colleges take advantage of in the next three years?
*Threats*: What is changing in the environment which could adversely affect the Alamo Colleges?
*Priorities 1*: What should the Alamo Colleges address immediately?
*Priorities 2*: What should the Alamo Colleges preserve at all costs?
*Priorities 3*: What future direction or decision should the Alamo Colleges avoid at all costs?
*Competitive Factors 1*: What do the Alamo Colleges do better than other institutions of higher education in the area?
*Competitive Factors 2*: What do other institutions of higher education in the area do better than the Alamo Colleges?

## The Respondents

In December 2012, 240 strategic planning contributors (identified by the five colleges and the district) were invited to take the online SWOT analysis survey, including questions about priorities and competitive factors.

The rate of response to this survey was 65 percent or 156 of 240 Alamo Colleges stakeholders completing the online survey. The distribution of respondents according to six stakeholder categories and six campuses was the following:

| Stakeholder | SAC | SPC | PAC | NVC | NLC | District | Not an employee of Alamo | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Faculty (Adjunct and Full-Time) | 6 | 1 | 4 | 11 | 6 | | | 28 |
| Vice Chancellor or College President | | | | | | 3* | | 3 |
| College Staff or Administrator | 13 | 6 | 10 | 8 | 12 | 4 | | 53 |
| District Staff or Administrator | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 49 | | 52 |
| Student | 4 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | | 3 | 13 |
| Community Member | | | | | | | 6 | 6 |
| Unknown | 1 | | | | | | | 1 |
| Total | 24 | 9 | 17 | 21 | 20 | 56 | 9 | 156 |

***** Presidents' responses were included in the District count to ensure their anonymity.

## Methodology

Collected responses to multiple choice questions were tabulated by stakeholder category and campus. Responses to open-ended questions were synthesized, categorized, and tabulated by stakeholder category and campus. The frequency distributions of all responses appear in Appendices B and C. The identified Alamo Colleges strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats, priorities, and competitive factors are presented below.

## Highlights of Results by Stakeholder Category

1. Top SWOT Results:

| Stakeholder | S | W | O | T |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Faculty | Affordability/value, Instruction quality, Student centeredness, Facilities, Programs offerings, Accessibility/recruitment, Employees' capabilities. | Employee support (benefits; development), Communication (internal; external), Collaboration between district and colleges, Collaboration among colleges, Leadership. | Articulation agreements with 4-year institutions, Workforce needs (capitalize on workforce demands for emerging industry programs; trained/skilled workers by existing/ incoming industries/companies), Annexation leading to increased enrollment and revenue, Technology (demand for new technologies; distance education; etc.), Dual credit, Partnerships. | Funding reductions, High school misalignment with colleges, Student/citizen issues (poor preparation; illiteracy; LEP), Accountability requirements, Community's negative image about community colleges, Competition from other higher education institutions. |
| Vice Chancellor or College President | Affordability/value, Accessibility/recruitment, Facilities, Leadership, Partnerships, Planning, Student support services, Technology. | Collaboration between district and colleges, Distance education, Graduation/completion, Instruction quality. | Annexation leading to increased enrollment/revenue, Establish/ strengthen partnerships, Technology (demand for new technologies; distance education; etc.), Workforce needs (capitalize on workforce demands for emerging industry programs; trained/skilled workers by existing and incoming industries/companies), Global initiatives. | Funding reductions, Accountability requirements, Student/citizen issues (poor preparation; illiteracy; LEP), Economic downturn, High school misalignment with colleges. |
| College Staff or Administrator | Affordability/value, Instruction quality, Accessibility/recruitment Employee support (benefits; development), Programs offerings, Student centeredness. | Collaboration between district and colleges, Communication (internal; external), Process improvement, Graduation/completion, Data-informed decision making, Leadership, Technology. | Annexation leading to increased enrollment and revenue, Workforce needs (capitalize on workforce demands for emerging industry programs; trained/skilled workers by existing and incoming industries/ companies), Establish/strengthen partnerships, New technology demands, Articulation agreements with four-year institutions, Demographic changes. | Funding reductions, High school misalignment with colleges, Student/citizen issues (poor preparation; illiteracy; LEP), Accountability requirements, Competition from other higher education institutions, Technology changes, Economic downturn. |
| District Staff or Administrator | Affordability/value, Programs offerings, Workforce and economic development (training; education; programs; support), Student centeredness, Financial management, Accessibility/recruitment. | Collaboration between district and colleges, Communication (internal; external), Collaboration among colleges, Data-informed decision making, Graduation/completion, Leadership, Process improvement. | Workforce needs (capitalize on workforce demands for emerging industry programs; trained/skilled workers by existing and incoming industries/ companies), Annexation leading to increased enrollment and revenue, Technology (demand for new technologies; distance education; etc.), Articulation agreements with four-year institutions, Establish/strengthen partnerships, Sustainability trends. | Funding reductions, High school misalignment with colleges, Accountability requirements, Competition from other higher education institutions, Student/citizen issues (poor preparation; illiteracy; LEP), Economic downturn, Political changes, Technology changes. |
| Student | Affordability/value, Student support services, Facilities, Leadership, Collaboration between district and colleges, Communication (internal; external), Technology. | Accessibility/recruitment, Collaboration among colleges, Communication (internal; external), Graduation/completion. | Articulation agreements with four-year institutions, Establish/ strengthen partnerships, Annexation leading to increased enrollment and revenue, Global initiatives, Dual credit program revenue increase, Slow economy prompting higher enrollments, Technology (demand for new technologies; distance education; etc.) | Funding reductions, Community's negative image about community colleges, Economic downturn, High school dropout rates, Inflation/cost of living, Student/citizen issues (poor preparation; illiteracy; LEP). |
| Community Member | Affordability/value, Programs offerings, Accessibility/recruitment, Institutional image/culture/pride, Workforce and economic development (training; education; programs; support). | Communication (internal; external), Partnerships, Collaboration between district and colleges, Employees' capabilities, Fundraising, Graduation/completion, Institutional image/ culture/pride, None, Planning, Retention strategies, Student support services, Technology. | Articulation agreements with four-year institutions, Establish/ strengthen partnerships, Annexation leading to increased enrollment and revenue, Workforce needs (capitalize on workforce demands for emerging industry programs; trained/skilled workers by existing and incoming industries/ companies). | Funding reductions, High school dropout rates, Competition from other higher education institutions, Economic downturn, Student/citizen issues (poor preparation; illiteracy; LEP). |

**S** = Strengths; **W** = Weaknesses; **O** = Opportunities; **T** = Threats

2. Top Priorities and Competitive Factors:

| Stakeholder | P1 | P2 | P3 | C1 | C2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Faculty | Funding: Budget shortfalls, Communication, Improve leadership, Support/care for employees, Too many initiatives. | Individual college cultures, Affordability, Small classes, Student centeredness. | Relying on more adjunct faculty. | Accessibility, Student centeredness, Student support. | Employee support, Higher completion/ graduation, Marketing, Provide better educational quality/value. |
| Vice Chancellor or College President | Improve processes. | Accessibility, Commitment to student success, Individual college cultures, Partnerships with community, Programs and course offerings. | Adding another college/ buildings, Blocking accessibility to minority/low income students, Emphasizing consolidation/central ization, Limiting enrollment, Pursuing/lowering standards to meet accountability by third parties. | Accessibility, Affordability. | Higher completion/ graduation, Marketing. |
| College Staff or Administrator | Funding: Budget shortfalls, Improve Processes, Collaboration, Communication. | Individual college cultures, Student centeredness, Quality employees, Accessibility, Affordability, Employee development/ training, Quality instruction. | Emphasizing consolidation/ centralization, Adding another college or buildings, Standardization of student instruction/ services. | Affordability, Provide better educational value, Student centeredness, Quality programs/ instructors/ instruction, Small classes. | Higher completion/ graduation, Marketing, More effective processes/services (enrollment/ registration/financial aid). |
| District Staff or Administrator | Alignment/ standardization across colleges, Eliminate inefficiencies and duplication of services, Collaboration. | Affordability, Leadership, Quality instruction. | Impediments to efficient centralization and process alignments, Emphasizing consolidation/ centralization. | Affordability, Accessibility, Provide better educational value. | Higher completion/ graduation, More effective processes/services (enrollment/ registration/ financial aid). |
| Student | High tuition cost, Financial aid. | Completion/ graduation rates, Quality employees. | Increasing tuition/fees, Eliminating low-enrollment classes. | Affordability, Student support. | Communication/ information, Offer more programs/ courses. |
| Community Member | Student centeredness, Financial aid, Marketing: Promote courses/programs offered, High tuition cost. | Affordability, Partnerships with community, Quality instruction, Student services, Workforce focus/training. | Increasing tuition/ fees. | Provide better educational value, Quality programs/ instructors/ instruction, Understand community needs, Student centeredness. | More effective processes/services (enrollment/ registration/financial aid). |

**P1** = Priorities 1: What should the Alamo Colleges **address** immediately?
**P2** = Priorities 2: What should the Alamo Colleges **preserve** at all costs?
**P3** = Priorities 3: What future direction or decision should the Alamo Colleges **avoid** at all costs?
**C1** = Competitor Factors 1: What do the **Alamo Colleges do better** than other institutions of higher education in the area?
**C2** = Competitor Factors 2: What do **other institutions of higher education in the area do better** than the Alamo Colleges?

## II. SWOT Analysis

The overall top five Alamo Colleges strengths and weaknesses as well as the overall top five opportunities and threats to the Alamo Colleges appear, along with their relative frequencies, in the following chart.

SWOT Analysis Overall Results (Top 5)

| Top 5 Strengths | Top 5 Weaknesses |
|---|---|
| Affordability/value, 22.1%<br>Instruction quality, 9.1%<br>Programs offerings, 7.5%<br>Accessibility/recruitment, 6.4%<br>Student centeredness, 6.0% | Collaboration between district and colleges, 13.9%<br>Communication (internal; external), 12.2%<br>Graduation/completion, 8.1%<br>Process improvement, 6.8%<br>Data-informed decision making, 6.1% |
| **Top 5 Opportunities** | **Top 5 Threats** |
| Workforce needs (capitalize on workforce demands for emerging industry programs; trained/skilled workers by existing and incoming industries/ companies), 16.4%<br>Annexation leading to increased enrollment and revenue, 15.1%<br>Articulation agreements with four-year institutions, 13.5%<br>Establish/strengthen partnerships, 12.2%<br>Technology (demand for new technologies; distance education; etc.), 12.2% | Funding reductions, 21.8%<br>High school misalignment with colleges, 12.0%<br>Student/citizen issues (poor preparation, illiteracy, LEP), 10.3%<br>Accountability requirements, 8.5%<br>Competition from other higher education institutions, 7.4% |

***** Percentages indicate proportion of responses within each cell.

The top SWOT Analysis results are presented by stakeholder category and campus in the following two tables. See Appendices B and C for a complete frequency distribution of all SWOT Analysis results.

SWOT Analysis Top Results by Stakeholder Category

| | Top Strength | Top Weakness | Top Opportunity | Top Threat |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Faculty** | Affordability/value | Employee support (benefits; development) | Articulation agreements with four-year institutions | Funding reductions; High school misalignment with colleges |
| **Vice Chancellor or College President** | Affordability/value | Collaboration between district and colleges; Distance education; Graduation/ completion; Instruction quality. | Annexation leading to increased enrollment and revenue; Establish/strengthen partnerships; Technology (demand for new technologies; distance education); Workforce needs (capitalize on workforce demands for emerging industry programs; trained/skilled workers by existing and new industries/companies). | Funding reductions |
| **College Staff or Administrator** | Affordability/value | Collaboration between district and colleges | Annexation leading to increased enrollment and revenue | Funding reductions |
| **District Staff or Administrator** | Affordability/value | Collaboration between district and colleges | Workforce needs (capitalize on workforce demands for emerging industry programs; trained/skilled workers by existing and incoming industries/companies) | Funding reductions |
| **Student** | Affordability/value | Accessibility/ recruitment | Articulation agreements with four-year institutions | Funding reductions |
| **Community Member** | Affordability/value | Communication (internal; external); Partnerships | Articulation agreements with four-year institutions | Funding reductions; High school dropout rates |

SWOT Analysis Top Results by Campus

| | Top Strength | Top Weakness | Top Opportunity | Top Threat |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **SAC** | Affordability/value | Communication (internal; external) | Annexation leading to increased enrollment and revenue | Funding reductions |
| **SPC** | Affordability/value | Collaboration between district and colleges | Workforce needs (capitalize on workforce demands for emerging industry programs, trained/skilled workers by existing and incoming industries/companies) | Funding reductions |
| **PAC** | Affordability/value | Collaboration between district and colleges; Communication (internal; external). | Workforce needs (capitalize on workforce demands for emerging industry programs; trained/skilled workers by existing and incoming industries/companies) | Funding reductions |
| **NVC** | Affordability/value | Communication (internal; external) | Articulation agreements with four-year institutions | Funding reductions |
| **NLC** | Affordability/value | Collaboration between district and colleges | Annexation leading to increased enrollment and revenue | Funding reductions |
| **District** | Affordability/value | Collaboration between district and colleges | Workforce needs (capitalize on workforce demands for emerging industry programs; trained/skilled workers by existing and incoming industries/companies) | Funding reductions |

## III. Priorities

What the Alamo Colleges should address, preserve, and avoid, are indicated in the following three charts.

### 1. What should the Alamo Colleges address immediately?

| | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| Funding (Funding issues and challenges (12); Funding alternatives (8); Funding Ed programs rather than facilities) | 21 | 13.5% |
| Completion/graduation. | 9 | 5.8% |
| Retention. | 8 | 5.2% |
| Internal/external communication. | 8 | 5.2% |
| Inefficient processes and systems. | 7 | 4.5% |
| Leadership issues (Leadership's disconnect with students' needs (2); Poor assertiveness; Management weaknesses; Lack of shared governance; Lack of transparency; Leadership development needs). | 7 | 4.5% |
| Low employee morale. | 6 | 3.9% |
| Technology issues (Problems with Banner modules; Failure to support MyMAP; Poor quality of new technology; Technology gaps; Problems with online registration; Limited inclusion of stakeholders in purchase decisions). | 6 | 3.9% |
| Collaboration/coordination between colleges and district. | 5 | 3.2% |
| Personnel issues (Keeping inefficient personnel; Limited employee empowerment; Limited professional development opportunities; Needed support of front-desk employees; The loss of highly skilled and experienced professionals). | 5 | 3.2% |
| Assess results of numerous initiatives and focus on what works. | 4 | 2.6% |
| Personnel shortages at colleges. | 4 | 2.6% |
| Salaries/compensation (Current pay levels; Disparities in pay between district and colleges). | 4 | 2.6% |
| 21st century trends/disciplines/strategies/standards. | 4 | 2.6% |
| Students' poor preparation for college. | 3 | 1.9% |
| Poor inclusiveness in governance and planning. | 3 | 1.9% |
| Program alignment with high schools. | 3 | 1.9% |
| Accountability. | 2 | 1.3% |
| Adjunct faculty compensation. | 2 | 1.3% |
| Culture (The institutional culture; create a culture of service and continuous improvement). | 2 | 1.3% |
| Enrollment/registration for first timers. | 2 | 1.3% |
| Faculty retention. | 2 | 1.3% |
| Financial aid. | 2 | 1.3% |
| Graduation. | 2 | 1.3% |
| HR - Hiring process inefficiencies. | 2 | 1.3% |
| Poor customer service. | 2 | 1.3% |
| Resource allocation fairness. | 2 | 1.3% |
| Trust issues. | 2 | 1.3% |
| Unsafe/difficult work environment for district offices. | 2 | 1.3% |
| Workforce and economic growth demands. | 2 | 1.3% |
| Other (Unique responses: Accreditation; Articulation agreements with universities; Consolidation of the five colleges; External competition; High tuition; Institutional advancement; Largest drop in enrollment without discussion and action; Meeting industry's needs; New program testing/rollout; Out-of-district tuition increases; Partnerships/cooperation; Problems with state legislature; Strengthen state reporting to ensure Success Points; Student diversity; Use of data for decision making). | 22 | 14.2% |
| **Total** | **155** | **100.0%** |

## 2. What should the Alamo Colleges preserve at all costs?

| | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| Quality instruction. | 27 | 16.4% |
| Affordability. | 26 | 15.8% |
| Individual college cultures. | 17 | 10.3% |
| Student centeredness. | 14 | 8.5% |
| Accessibility. | 11 | 6.7% |
| Services. | 8 | 4.8% |
| Focus on community needs. | 5 | 3.0% |
| Programs. | 5 | 3.0% |
| Employee development/training. | 4 | 2.4% |
| Reputation. | 4 | 2.4% |
| Small class sizes. | 4 | 2.4% |
| Job security. | 3 | 1.8% |
| Leadership opportunities. | 3 | 1.8% |
| Recruitment. | 3 | 1.8% |
| Respect for employees. | 3 | 1.8% |
| Standardized processes. | 3 | 1.8% |
| Collaboration/communication. | 2 | 1.2% |
| Funding for colleges. | 2 | 1.2% |
| Integrity. | 2 | 1.2% |
| Other (Unique responses: Academic freedom; Alamo Colleges single brand; ALAS program; Baldrige implementation; Continuous improvement; Coordination of curriculum with employment opportunities; Data-based decision making; Employee benefits; Faculty engagement/morale; Faculty tenure; Focus on economic and workforce development; Inclusive governance; Marketing; New initiatives/approaches; Night and weekend classes; Sound financial management; Technology; The mission; The values). | 19 | 11.5% |
| **Total** | **165** | **100.0%** |

## 3. What future direction or decision should the Alamo Colleges avoid at all costs?

| | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| Faculty/personnel issues (Reducing faculty (2); Reducing personnel (4); Shifting personnel/duties ineffectively; Replacing FT faculty with PT faculty; Neglecting faculty development; Limiting career advancement of current talent; Neglecting faculty quality; Neglecting faculty salaries; Neglecting faculty's input in decision making; Maintaining excess faculty; Maintaining incompetent faculty; Maintaining incompetent senior leaders). | 18 | 16.8% |
| Financial issues (Wasting funding (2); Reducing funding (4); Keeping high costs for students (6); Cutting employee benefits). | 13 | 12.1% |
| Eliminating individual college autonomy/accreditation/culture. | 8 | 7.5% |
| Adding buildings/campuses without resources. | 6 | 5.6% |
| Maintaining status quo. | 5 | 4.7% |
| Cutting education programs/classes. | 4 | 3.7% |
| Interfering with student services (admissions, registration, payment). | 4 | 3.7% |
| Limiting innovation and support of technology. | 4 | 3.7% |
| Neglecting students (Losing focus on students (2); Neglecting disadvantaged students; Creating an impersonal environment). | 4 | 3.7% |
| Making top-down decisions. | 4 | 3.7% |
| Reducing academic rigor/standards. | 4 | 3.7% |
| Standardizing /curricula/processes/services. | 4 | 3.7% |
| Limiting enrollment. | 3 | 2.8% |
| Offering 4-year degrees. | 2 | 1.9% |
| Divisiveness among the district and the colleges. | 2 | 1.9% |
| Other (Unique responses: A myopic focus on trends and data; Changing the ERP system; Excessive emphasis on online programs; Focusing on winning national awards; Limiting higher level online courses; Limiting leadership continuity; Losing focus on improving employee morale; Maintaining a variety of core classes; Neglecting current issues; Neglecting K-12 partnerships; Neglecting the mission, vision, and values; Outsourcing instruction and services; Politics within the schools; Returning to a silo mindset). | 14 | 13.1% |
| **Total** | **107** | **100.0%** |

The top priorities for the Alamo Colleges are divided by stakeholder category and campus in the following two tables.

Top Priorities for the Alamo Colleges by Stakeholder Category

| | 1. What the Alamo Colleges should address immediately | 2. What the Alamo Colleges should preserve at all costs | 3. What the Alamo Colleges should avoid at all costs |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Faculty** | Funding (Funding issues and challenges (12); Funding alternatives (8); Funding Ed. programs rather than facilities); Poor inclusiveness in governance and planning. | Quality instruction. | Faculty/personnel issues (Reducing faculty (2); Reducing personnel (4); Shifting personnel/duties ineffectively; Replacing FT faculty with PT faculty; Neglecting faculty development; Limiting career advancement of current talent; Neglecting faculty quality; Neglecting faculty salaries; Neglecting faculty's input in decision making; Maintaining excess faculty; Maintaining incompetent faculty; Maintaining incompetent senior leaders). |
| **Vice Chancellor or College President** | Collaboration/coordination between colleges and district; Resource allocation fairness. | Accessibility; Affordability; Quality instruction. | Neglecting students (Losing focus on students (2); Neglecting disadvantaged students; Creating an impersonal environment). |
| **College Staff or Administrator** | Funding (Funding issues and challenges (12); Funding alternatives (8); Funding Ed. programs rather than facilities) | Individual college cultures. | Faculty/personnel issues (Reducing faculty (2); Reducing personnel (4); Shifting personnel/duties ineffectively; Replacing FT faculty with PT faculty; Neglecting faculty development; Limiting career advancement of current talent; Neglecting faculty quality; Neglecting faculty salaries; Neglecting faculty's input in decision making; Maintaining excess faculty; Maintaining incompetent faculty; Maintaining incompetent senior leaders). |
| **District Staff or Administrator** | Internal and external communication. | Affordability. | Eliminating individual college autonomy/accreditation/culture. |
| **Student** | Completion/graduation; Funding (Funding issues and challenges (12); Funding alternatives (8); Funding Ed. programs rather than facilities). | Affordability; Funding for colleges; Quality instruction. | Financial issues (Wasting funding (2); Reducing funding (4); Keeping high costs for students (6); Cutting employee benefits). |
| **Community Member** | Completion/graduation; Leadership issues (Leadership's disconnect with students' needs (2); Poor assertiveness; Management weaknesses; Lack of shared governance; Lack of transparency; Leadership development needs); Students' poor preparation for college. | Affordability. | Eliminating individual college autonomy/accreditation/culture. |

Top Priorities for the Alamo Colleges by Campus

| | 1. What the Alamo Colleges should address immediately | 2. What the Alamo Colleges should preserve at all costs | 3. What the Alamo Colleges should avoid at all costs |
|---|---|---|---|
| **SAC** | Funding (Funding issues and challenges (12); Funding alternatives (8); Funding Ed programs rather than facilities). | Individual college cultures. | Faculty/personnel issues (Reducing faculty (2); Reducing personnel (4); Shifting personnel/duties ineffectively; Replacing FT faculty with PT faculty; Neglecting faculty development; Limiting career advancement of current talent; Neglecting faculty quality; Neglecting faculty salaries; Neglecting faculty's input in decision making; Maintaining excess faculty; Maintaining incompetent faculty; Maintaining incompetent senior leaders). |
| **SPC** | Inefficient processes and systems. | Reputation; Services. | Eliminating individual college autonomy/accreditation/culture. |
| **PAC** | Retention. | Affordability. | Adding buildings/campuses without resources; Financial issues (Wasting funding (2); Reducing funding (4); Keeping high costs for students (6); Cutting employee benefits). |
| **NVC** | Funding (Funding issues and challenges (12); Funding alternatives (8); Funding Ed programs rather than facilities). | Quality instruction. | Faculty/personnel issues (Reducing faculty (2); Reducing personnel (4); Shifting personnel/duties ineffectively; Replacing FT faculty with PT faculty; Neglecting faculty development; Limiting career advancement of current talent; Neglecting faculty quality; Neglecting faculty salaries; Neglecting faculty's input in decision making; Maintaining excess faculty; Maintaining incompetent faculty; Maintaining incompetent senior leaders). |
| **NLC** | Funding (Funding issues and challenges (12); Funding alternatives (8); Funding Ed programs rather than facilities); Internal/external communication; Salaries/compensation (Current pay levels; Disparities in pay between district and colleges). | Affordability; Quality instruction. | Financial issues (Wasting funding (2); Reducing funding (4); Keeping high costs for students (6); Cutting employee benefits). |
| **District** | Funding (Funding issues and challenges (12); Funding alternatives (8); Funding Ed programs rather than facilities). | Affordability. | Eliminating individual college autonomy/accreditation/culture. |

# IV. Competitive Factor Analysis

The analysis of competitive factors among local institutions of higher education revealed that the Alamo Colleges are stronger than other schools in offering affordability, better educational value, accessibility, and centeredness to students, whereas area competing schools have more effective marketing, internal processes (recruitment/enrollment/registration, completion/graduation, record-keeping, transcript processing, short pathways), fundraising, and customer service.

Overall Competitive Factor Analysis Results

## What Alamo Colleges Do Better Than Competitors

| | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| Affordability. | 38 | 26.2% |
| Value. | 21 | 14.5% |
| Accessibility. | 13 | 9.0% |
| Student centeredness. | 13 | 9.0% |
| High quality of instruction. | 10 | 6.9% |
| Small class size. | 6 | 4.1% |
| Workforce development. | 6 | 4.1% |
| Partnerships with community. | 4 | 2.8% |
| Program variety. | 4 | 2.8% |
| Student services. | 4 | 2.8% |
| Developmental education. | 2 | 1.4% |
| Distance education. | 2 | 1.4% |
| Dual credit. | 2 | 1.4% |
| Flexibility/agility. | 2 | 1.4% |
| Open admission. | 2 | 1.4% |
| Other (Unique responses: Facilities; Innovation; Leadership; Marketing; Nothing; Better student-to-teacher ratios; Collaborative learning; College-high school synergy on academic programs; Communication; Organizational development activities; Recruit quality employees; Strategic planning; Student engagement; Student outreach; Technology; Training in PTE areas). | 16 | 11.0% |
| **Total** | **145** | **100.0%** |

## What Competitors Do Better Than Alamo Colleges

| | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| Marketing. | 19 | 16.0% |
| Processes | 18 | 15.1% |
| Fundraising. | 6 | 5.0% |
| Customer service. | 5 | 4.2% |
| Nothing. | 5 | 4.2% |
| Student support services. | 5 | 4.2% |
| Advising. | 4 | 3.4% |
| Quality instruction. | 4 | 3.4% |
| Completion/graduation. | 3 | 2.5% |
| Respect for employees/faculty. | 3 | 2.5% |
| Accessibility. | 2 | 1.7% |
| Decision making and implementation. | 2 | 1.7% |
| Faculty engagement. | 2 | 1.7% |
| Faculty quality. | 2 | 1.7% |
| Financial aid. | 2 | 1.7% |
| Resources - Funding. | 2 | 1.7% |
| Image/prestige. | 2 | 1.7% |
| Innovation. | 2 | 1.7% |
| School spirit and activities. | 2 | 1.7% |
| Student centeredness. | 2 | 1.7% |
| Student retention. | 2 | 1.7% |
| Training. | 2 | 1.7% |
| Other (Unique responses: Adjunct faculty recruitment; Communication; Competitive costs; Curriculum; Developmental education; Distance education; Everything; Faculty retention; Focus on their competition; Funding for international students; Graduation/completion; Information systems; Leadership/management; Less bureaucracy; Monetary incentives to students; Offer bachelor's degrees; Policies; Program variety; Qualified leaders; School spirit and activities; School spirit and activities; Student engagement; Student tracking; Technology; Weekend/night/online classes). | 23 | 19.3% |
| **Total** | **119** | **100.0%** |

Competitive factor analysis results are presented by stakeholder category and by campus in the following two tables.

Competitive Factor Analysis Top Results by Stakeholder Category

| | What Alamo Colleges Do Better Than Competitors | What Competitors Do Better Than Alamo Colleges |
|---|---|---|
| **Faculty** | Affordability. | Marketing. |
| **Vice Chancellor or College President** | Accessibility, Value. | Faculty engagement. |
| **College Staff or Administrator** | Affordability. | Internal processes (Recruitment/enrollment/registration; Completion/graduation; Record-keeping; Transcript Processing; Short pathways). |
| **District Staff or Administrator** | Affordability. | Marketing. |
| **Student** | Affordability; Student centeredness; Value. | Marketing; Nothing; Resources/Funding; School spirit and activities; Student centeredness. |
| **Community Member** | High quality of instruction. | Completion/graduation; Internal processes (Recruitment/enrollment/registration; Completion/graduation; Record-keeping; Transcript Processing; Short pathways); Student support services; Other. |

Competitive Factor Analysis Top Results by Campus

| | What Alamo Colleges Do Better Than Competitors | What Competitors Do Better Than Alamo Colleges |
|---|---|---|
| **SAC** | Affordability, Provide better educational value. | Marketing. |
| **SPC** | Affordability. | Internal processes (Recruitment/enrollment/registration; Completion/graduation; Record-keeping; Transcript Processing; Short pathways). |
| **PAC** | Student centeredness. | Marketing. |
| **NVC** | Affordability. | Internal processes (Recruitment/enrollment/ registration; Completion/graduation; Record-keeping; Transcript Processing; Short pathways). |
| **NLC** | Accessibility. | Internal processes (Recruitment/enrollment/ registration; Completion/graduation; Record-keeping; Transcript Processing; Short pathways). |
| **District** | Affordability. | Marketing. |

# V. APPENDICES

**Appendix A.** Sample of SWOT Analysis Survey (Page 18)

**Appendix B.** Frequency Distribution of Responses to SWOT Survey by Stakeholder Category (Page 25)

**Appendix C.** Frequency Distribution of Responses to SWOT Survey by Campus (Page 28)

**Appendix D.** Comments Provided by Responding Stakeholders (Page 31)

**Appendix A.** Sample of SWOT Analysis Survey

ALAMO COLLEGES

**The Alamo Way: Always Inspire, Always Improve**

# 2012 SWOT Analysis Survey

**What is a SWOT analysis?**

A SWOT analysis is a simple, powerful, and necessary tool in strategic development. It involves the evaluation of Alamo Colleges strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats.

The strengths and weaknesses represent internal factors. The strengths refer to competitive advantages or core competencies that give the Alamo Colleges a better position in meeting the needs of students and the community. Weaknesses refer to any limitations the Alamo Colleges might face in developing or implementing a strategy.

Opportunities and threats are external to the Alamo Colleges, but they can greatly affect the organization's operation. Opportunities refer to favorable conditions in the environment that could produce positive outcomes for the Alamo Colleges, whereas threats refer to negative conditions or barriers that may prevent the Alamo Colleges from reaching stated goals and objectives.

Knowing each SWOT element, and matching internal strengths to external opportunities, converting weaknesses into strengths, and converting external threats into opportunities, will help us develop strategies to more effectively meet the needs of our students and the community.

In preparation for the Strategic Planning Retreat of February 18, 2013, please complete this SWOT analysis survey from the perspective of your role as a leader of the Alamo Colleges system (colleges and district combined). Your input will help shape the future of the Alamo Colleges. Your responses will be collected along with those from other leaders to produce a summary report, thereby ensuring your anonymity. If you have any questions, contact Dr. Carlos Ayala, Coordinator of Strategic Planning, at (210) 485-0750.

## 1. Indicate your affiliation.

- SAC
- SPC
- PAC
- NVC
- NLC
- District (District Support Operations)
- Not an employee of Alamo Colleges

# 2. Indicate your occupation category

- Full-Time Faculty
- Adjunct Faculty
- Vice Chancellor or College President
- College Staff or Administrator
- District Staff or Administrator
- Student
- Community Member (not an Alamo Colleges employee or student)

# 3. Alamo Colleges Strengths

**What are the top 3 things that the Alamo Colleges do well?**
(Specifically, consider the greatest internal institutional strengths which should be maintained; all aspects that affect the organization's performance and its prospects for the future; services, operations, relationships, facilities, resources, technology, people, etc.; competitive advantages or core competencies)

- ☐ Accessibility/recruitment
- ☐ Affordability/value
- ☐ Budgeting/resource allocation
- ☐ Collaboration among colleges
- ☐ Collaboration between district and colleges
- ☐ Communication (internal, external)
- ☐ Data-informed decision making
- ☐ Distance education
- ☐ Employee support (benefits, development)
- ☐ Employees' capabilities
- ☐ Facilities
- ☐ Financial management
- ☐ Funding
- ☐ Fundraising
- ☐ Graduation/completion
- ☐ Institutional image/culture/pride

- ☐ Instruction quality
- ☐ Leadership
- ☐ Marketing/promotion program
- ☐ Partnerships
- ☐ Planning
- ☐ Process improvement
- ☐ Programs offerings
- ☐ Retention strategies
- ☐ Student centeredness
- ☐ Student support services
- ☐ Technology
- ☐ Workforce and economic development (training, education, programs, support)
- ☐ Other (please provide other strengths not listed above): _____

# 4. Alamo Colleges Weaknesses

**What are the top 3 things that the Alamo Colleges should improve?**
(Specifically, consider the greatest internal institutional strengths which should be maintained; all aspects that affect the organization's performance and its prospects for the future; services, operations, relationships, facilities, resources, technology, people, etc.; competitive advantages or core competencies)

- ☐ Accessibility/recruitment
- ☐ Affordability/value
- ☐ Budgeting/resource allocation
- ☐ Collaboration among colleges
- ☐ Collaboration between district and colleges
- ☐ Communication (internal, external)
- ☐ Data-informed decision making
- ☐ Distance education
- ☐ Employee support (benefits, development)
- ☐ Employees' capabilities
- ☐ Facilities
- ☐ Financial management

- ☐ Funding
- ☐ Fundraising
- ☐ Graduation/completion
- ☐ Institutional image/culture/pride
- ☐ Instruction quality
- ☐ Leadership
- ☐ Marketing/promotion program
- ☐ Partnerships
- ☐ Planning
- ☐ Process improvement
- ☐ Programs offerings
- ☐ Retention strategies
- ☐ Student centeredness
- ☐ Student support services
- ☐ Technology
- ☐ Workforce and economic development (training, education, programs, support)
- ☐ Other (please provide other weaknesses not listed above):

# 5. Opportunities for the Alamo Colleges

**What opportunities could the Alamo Colleges take advantage of in the next three years?**
(Specifically, consider the most important EXTERNAL opportunities; all favorable conditions in the current and future operating environments, e.g., social, cultural, demographic, economic, political, legal, local, state, national, global, etc.; the full range of stakeholders)

- ☐ Annexation leading to increased enrollment and revenue
- ☐ Articulation agreements with four-year institutions
- ☐ Demographic changes
- ☐ Dual credit program revenue increase
- ☐ Establish/strengthen partnerships
- ☐ Global initiatives
- ☐ Political changes
- ☐ Slow economy prompting higher enrollments

- ☐ Socio-cultural changes
- ☐ Sustainability trends
- ☐ Technology (demand for new technologies, distance education, etc.)
- ☐ Workforce needs (capitalize on workforce demands for emerging industry programs, trained/skilled workers by existing and incoming industries/companies)
- ☐ Other (please provide other external opportunities not listed above):

Optional: Please provide details for the opportunities you checked above.

# 6. Threats to Alamo Colleges

**What is changing in the environment which could adversely affect the Alamo Colleges?**
(Specifically, consider all EXTERNAL threats to the organization; all Alamo Colleges current and likely future operating environments, e.g., social, cultural, demographic, economic, political, legal, local, state, national, global, etc.; all conditions or barriers that may prevent the Alamo Colleges from fulfilling the mission or achieving the vision)

- ☐ Accountability requirements
- ☐ Accreditation requirements
- ☐ Alternative energy issues
- ☐ Community's disengagement/complacency
- ☐ Community's negative image about community colleges
- ☐ Competition from other higher education institutions
- ☐ Demographic changes
- ☐ Economic downturn
- ☐ Funding reductions
- ☐ Globalization
- ☐ High school dropout rates
- ☐ High school misalignment with colleges
- ☐ Inflation/cost of living
- ☐ Lawsuits and bad press
- ☐ Legal/regulatory changes
- ☐ Nursing/Allied Health instructor availability
- ☐ Political changes

- ☐ Population growth
- ☐ Poverty
- ☐ Student/citizen issues (poor preparation, illiteracy, LEP)
- ☐ Technology changes
- ☐ Other (please provide other external threats not listed above):

Optional: Please provide details for the threats you checked above.

# 7. Alamo Colleges Priorities

**What should the Alamo Colleges address immediately?**

**What should the Alamo Colleges preserve at all costs?**

**What future direction or decision should the Alamo Colleges avoid at all costs?**

# 8. Alamo Colleges Competition

**What do the Alamo Colleges do better than other institutions of higher education in the area?**

**What do other institutions of higher education in the area do better than the Alamo Colleges?**

# 9. Other Comments

Finish

## **Appendix B.** Frequency Distribution of Responses to SWOT Survey by Stakeholder Category

| STRENGTHS | Faculty | Vice Chancellor or College President | College Staff or Administrator | District Staff or Administrator | Student | Community Member | TOTAL | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Affordability/value | 18 | 2 | 34 | 32 | 9 | 4 | **99** | **22.0%** |
| Instruction quality | 13 | | 19 | 7 | 1 | 1 | **41** | **9.1%** |
| Programs offerings | 6 | | 7 | 17 | 1 | 3 | **34** | **7.5%** |
| Accessibility/recruitment | 5 | 1 | 13 | 8 | | 2 | **29** | **6.4%** |
| Student centeredness | 7 | | 7 | 12 | 1 | | **27** | **6.0%** |
| Workforce and economic development (training; education; programs; support) | 1 | | 2 | 17 | 1 | 2 | **23** | **5.1%** |
| Facilities | 6 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 1 | **22** | **4.9%** |
| Student support services | 3 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 6 | | **21** | **4.7%** |
| Employee support (benefits; development) | 1 | | 11 | 7 | | | **19** | **4.2%** |
| Leadership | | 1 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 1 | **14** | **3.1%** |
| Financial management | 1 | | 3 | 9 | 1 | | **14** | **3.1%** |
| Institutional image/culture/pride | 2 | | 6 | 3 | 1 | 2 | **14** | **3.1%** |
| Employees' capabilities | 5 | | 6 | 2 | | | **13** | **2.9%** |
| Partnerships | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4 | | 1 | **12** | **2.7%** |
| Marketing/promotion program | 1 | | 6 | 3 | 1 | | **11** | **2.4%** |
| Budgeting/resource allocation | | | 3 | 5 | | | **8** | **1.8%** |
| Technology | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | | **7** | **1.6%** |
| Data-informed decision making | 2 | | 2 | 3 | | | **7** | **1.6%** |
| Distance education | 1 | | 3 | 1 | 1 | | **6** | **1.3%** |
| Graduation/completion | 2 | | 2 | 1 | | 1 | **6** | **1.3%** |
| Process improvement | 1 | | | 4 | 1 | | **6** | **1.3%** |
| Collaboration among colleges | 1 | | 3 | 1 | | | **5** | **1.1%** |
| Communication (internal; external) | 1 | | | | 2 | | **3** | **0.7%** |
| Planning | | 1 | | 2 | | | **3** | **0.7%** |
| Fundraising | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | **3** | **0.7%** |
| Collaboration between district and colleges | | | | | 2 | | **2** | **0.4%** |
| College leadership | | | 1 | | | | **1** | **0.2%** |
| Retention strategies | 1 | | | | | | **1** | **0.2%** |
| | **81** | **9** | **151** | **156** | **36** | **18** | **451** | **100.0%** |

| WEAKNESSES | Faculty | Vice Chancellor or College President | College Staff or Administrator | District Staff or Administrator | Student | Community Member | TOTAL | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Collaboration between district and colleges | 8 | 2 | 24 | 27 | 2 | 1 | **64** | **14.0%** |
| Communication (internal; external) | 9 | | 23 | 19 | 3 | 2 | **56** | **12.3%** |
| Graduation/completion | 4 | 2 | 12 | 14 | 3 | 1 | **36** | **7.9%** |
| Process improvement | 4 | | 15 | 9 | 2 | | **30** | **6.6%** |
| Collaboration among colleges | 6 | | 3 | 15 | 3 | | **27** | **5.9%** |
| Data-informed decision making | 1 | | 11 | 15 | | | **27** | **5.9%** |
| Leadership | 6 | | 9 | 10 | 1 | | **26** | **5.7%** |
| Employee support (benefits; development) | 10 | | 5 | 5 | | | **20** | **4.4%** |
| Budgeting/resource allocation | 4 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 1 | | **15** | **3.3%** |
| Student support services | 4 | | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | **14** | **3.1%** |
| Retention strategies | 3 | | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | **12** | **2.6%** |
| Technology | 4 | | 7 | | | 1 | **12** | **2.6%** |
| Planning | 4 | | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | **11** | **2.4%** |
| Funding | 3 | | 4 | 1 | 2 | | **10** | **2.2%** |
| Fundraising | 1 | | 5 | 2 | 1 | 1 | **10** | **2.2%** |
| Accessibility/recruitment | | | 4 | | 5 | | **9** | **2.0%** |
| Institutional image/culture/pride | 2 | | | 3 | 2 | 1 | **8** | **1.8%** |
| Marketing/promotion program | | | 4 | 4 | | | **8** | **1.8%** |
| Student centeredness | 2 | | 4 | 1 | 1 | | **8** | **1.8%** |
| Distance education | | 2 | 3 | 2 | | | **7** | **1.5%** |
| Financial management | 2 | | 1 | 4 | | | **7** | **1.5%** |
| Instruction quality | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | | | **6** | **1.3%** |
| Affordability/value | | | 2 | 2 | 1 | | **5** | **1.1%** |
| Employees' capabilities | 1 | | 1 | 2 | | 1 | **5** | **1.1%** |
| Facilities | 1 | | 1 | 3 | | | **5** | **1.1%** |
| Partnerships | | | 1 | | | 2 | **3** | **0.7%** |
| Programs offerings | | | | 1 | 2 | | **3** | **0.7%** |
| Workforce and economic development (training; education; programs; support) | | | 1 | | 1 | | **2** | **0.4%** |
| College Connection on-site at the high school for all the steps of becoming a student in any IHE. | | | 1 | | | | **1** | **0.2%** |
| Excessive number of projects/initiatives under limited resources | | | 1 | | | | **1** | **0.2%** |
| High turn over of highly skilled/experienced employees | | | 1 | | | | **1** | **0.2%** |
| Hiring at colleges | | | 1 | | | | **1** | **0.2%** |
| Lacking policies on harrassment prevention other than sexual | | | 1 | | | | **1** | **0.2%** |
| Low customer service from limited staff/resources | | | | 1 | | | **1** | **0.2%** |
| None | | | | | | 1 | **1** | **0.2%** |
| Parking | | | | | 1 | | **1** | **0.2%** |
| Registration Process | | | | | 1 | | **1** | **0.2%** |
| Too many initiatives at same time interfere with delivery of instruction | 1 | | | | | | **1** | **0.2%** |
| | **81** | **9** | **163** | **153** | **36** | **14** | **456** | **100.0%** |

| OPPORTUNITIES | Faculty | Vice Chancellor or College President | College Staff or Administrator | District Staff or Administrator | Student | Community Member | TOTAL | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Workforce needs (capitalize on workforce demands for emerging industry programs; trained/skilled workers by existing and incoming industries/companies) | 12 | 2 | 26 | 30 | 2 | 3 | **75** | **16.5%** |
| Annexation leading to increased enrollment and revenue | 11 | 2 | 27 | 21 | 4 | 3 | **68** | **14.9%** |
| Articulation agreements with four-year institutions | 16 | | 15 | 18 | 8 | 4 | **61** | **13.4%** |
| Establish/strengthen partnerships | 7 | 2 | 19 | 17 | 6 | 4 | **55** | **12.1%** |
| Technology (demand for new technologies; distance education; etc.) | 10 | 2 | 19 | 21 | 3 | 1 | **56** | **12.3%** |
| Dual credit program revenue increase | 7 | | 9 | 7 | 3 | | **26** | **5.7%** |
| Sustainability trends | 3 | | 8 | 10 | 2 | 1 | **24** | **5.3%** |
| Demographic changes | 3 | | 14 | 5 | 2 | | **24** | **5.3%** |
| Slow economy prompting higher enrollments | 3 | | 10 | 2 | 3 | 1 | **19** | **4.2%** |
| Global initiatives | 2 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 1 | **15** | **3.3%** |
| Socio-cultural changes | 2 | | 5 | 5 | 2 | | **14** | **3.1%** |
| Political changes | 3 | | 6 | 4 | | | **13** | **2.9%** |
| Dual credit as a means of recruiting | | | 1 | | | | **1** | **0.2%** |
| Pilots of innovative models like I-BEST and PASS that increase success for lower-skilled students | | | | 1 | | | **1** | **0.2%** |
| Paradigm shift in teaching and learning taking place now | | | | 1 | | | **1** | **0.2%** |
| Increased demand for affordability | | | | 1 | | | **1** | **0.2%** |
| Offer independent mini prep programs that bridge the gap between highschool and college readiness. | | | | 1 | | | **1** | **0.2%** |
| | **79** | **9** | **161** | **149** | **39** | **18** | **455** | **100.0%** |

| THREATS | Faculty | Vice Chancellor or College President | College Staff or Administrator | District Staff or Administrator | Student | Community Member | TOTAL | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Funding reductions | 15 | 3 | 40 | 29 | 9 | 3 | **99** | **21.9%** |
| High school misalignment with colleges | 15 | 1 | 20 | 16 | 2 | | **54** | **11.9%** |
| Student/citizen issues (poor preparation, illiteracy, LEP) | 11 | 2 | 17 | 12 | 3 | 2 | **47** | **10.4%** |
| Accountability requirements | 9 | 2 | 12 | 15 | | 1 | **39** | **8.6%** |
| Competition from other higher education institutions | 5 | | 11 | 14 | 1 | 2 | **33** | **7.3%** |
| Economic downturn | 3 | 1 | 7 | 9 | 5 | 2 | **27** | **6.0%** |
| Community's negative image about community colleges | 6 | | 4 | 5 | 5 | | **20** | **4.4%** |
| Technology changes | 1 | | 8 | 9 | | | **18** | **4.0%** |
| Political changes | 2 | | 6 | 9 | | | **17** | **3.8%** |
| High school dropout rates | 3 | | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | **15** | **3.3%** |
| Inflation/cost of living | 2 | | 3 | 6 | 3 | 1 | **15** | **3.3%** |
| Community's disengagement/complacency | 3 | | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | **13** | **2.9%** |
| Accreditation requirements | 3 | | 6 | 1 | | | **10** | **2.2%** |
| Poverty | | | 3 | 4 | 2 | 1 | **10** | **2.2%** |
| Legal/regulatory changes | 1 | | 4 | 1 | 1 | | **7** | **1.5%** |
| Demographic changes | | | 1 | 4 | | | **5** | **1.1%** |
| Limited Nursing/Allied Health instructor availability | | | 3 | | 2 | | **5** | **1.1%** |
| Globalization | | | 2 | 2 | | | **4** | **0.9%** |
| Lawsuits and bad press | 1 | | 1 | 2 | | | **4** | **0.9%** |
| Population growth | 1 | | 2 | 1 | | | **4** | **0.9%** |
| Alternative energy issues | | | | 1 | 1 | | **2** | **0.4%** |
| New federal financial aid regulations | 1 | | | | | | **1** | **0.2%** |
| Online educational programs | | | | 1 | | | **1** | **0.2%** |
| State measurement of performance based on faulty indicators | | | | 1 | | | **1** | **0.2%** |
| MOOCs/Khan Academy | | | 1 | | | | **1** | **0.2%** |
| | **82** | **9** | **157** | **149** | **39** | **16** | **452** | **100.0%** |

## **Appendix C.** Frequency Distribution of Responses to SWOT Survey by Campus

| STRENGTHS | SAC | SPC | PAC | NVC | NLC | District | Students and Community | TOTAL | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Affordability/value | 17 | 5 | 11 | 17 | 10 | 33 | 7 | **100** | **22.1%** |
| Instruction quality | 11 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 2 | **41** | **9.1%** |
| Programs offerings | 5 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 16 | 3 | **34** | **7.5%** |
| Accessibility/recruitment | 3 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 2 | **29** | **6.4%** |
| Student centeredness | 2 | | 4 | 6 | 3 | 12 | | **27** | **6.0%** |
| Workforce and economic development (training; education; programs; support) | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 17 | 1 | **23** | **5.1%** |
| Facilities | 2 | | 2 | 7 | 4 | 6 | 1 | **22** | **4.9%** |
| Student support services | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 1 | **21** | **4.6%** |
| Employee support (benefits; development) | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 8 | | **19** | **4.2%** |
| Leadership | 4 | | 1 | | 3 | 6 | | **14** | **3.1%** |
| Financial management | 2 | | 1 | | | 10 | 1 | **14** | **3.1%** |
| Institutional image/culture/pride | 3 | | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | **14** | **3.1%** |
| Employees' capabilities | 5 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | | **13** | **2.9%** |
| Partnerships | 1 | 2 | | | 4 | 5 | | **12** | **2.7%** |
| Marketing/promotion program | 1 | | | 2 | 4 | 3 | 1 | **11** | **2.4%** |
| Budgeting/resource allocation | 1 | | | | 1 | 6 | | **8** | **1.8%** |
| Technology | 1 | 1 | | | 3 | 2 | | **7** | **1.5%** |
| Data-informed decision making | 3 | | 1 | | | 3 | | **7** | **1.5%** |
| Distance education | 2 | | 2 | | | 1 | 1 | **6** | **1.3%** |
| Graduation/completion | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 2 | 1 | **6** | **1.3%** |
| Process improvement | | 1 | | 1 | | 4 | | **6** | **1.3%** |
| Collaboration among colleges | | 2 | | 2 | | 1 | | **5** | **1.1%** |
| Communication (internal; external) | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | | **3** | **0.7%** |
| Planning | | | | | | 3 | | **3** | **0.7%** |
| Fundraising | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | **3** | **0.7%** |
| Collaboration between district and colleges | 1 | | | | | | 1 | **2** | **0.4%** |
| College leadership | | | | 1 | | | | **1** | **0.2%** |
| Retention strategies | 1 | | | | | | | **1** | **0.2%** |
| | **71** | **24** | **44** | **64** | **60** | **165** | **24** | **452** | **100.0%** |

| WEAKNESSES | SAC | SPC | PAC | NVC | NLC | District | Students and Community | TOTAL | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Collaboration between district and colleges | 9 | 5 | 7 | 3 | 9 | 30 | 1 | **64** | **13.9%** |
| Communication (internal; external) | 11 | 2 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 19 | 2 | **56** | **12.2%** |
| Graduation/completion | 9 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 17 | 1 | **37** | **8.1%** |
| Process improvement | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 9 | | **31** | **6.8%** |
| Data-informed decision making | 5 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 15 | | **28** | **6.1%** |
| Collaboration among colleges | 2 | | 1 | 4 | 3 | 16 | 1 | **27** | **5.9%** |
| Leadership | 6 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 8 | | **26** | **5.7%** |
| Employee support (benefits; development) | 3 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 3 | 5 | | **20** | **4.4%** |
| Budgeting/resource allocation | 2 | | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | | **15** | **3.3%** |
| Student support services | 3 | | 1 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 2 | **14** | **3.1%** |
| Retention strategies | 2 | | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 | **12** | **2.6%** |
| Technology | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | **12** | **2.6%** |
| Planning | 3 | 1 | | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | **11** | **2.4%** |
| Funding | 3 | 1 | | 2 | 3 | 1 | | **10** | **2.2%** |
| Fundraising | | | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | **10** | **2.2%** |
| Accessibility/recruitment | 2 | | 2 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | **9** | **2.0%** |
| Institutional image/culture/pride | 2 | | 1 | | | 3 | 2 | **8** | **1.7%** |
| Marketing/promotion program | | | 3 | | | 5 | | **8** | **1.7%** |
| Student centeredness | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | **8** | **1.7%** |
| Distance education | | | 2 | | 2 | 3 | | **7** | **1.5%** |
| Financial management | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 4 | | **7** | **1.5%** |
| Instruction quality | | | | 1 | 1 | 4 | | **6** | **1.3%** |
| Affordability/value | 1 | | 2 | | | 2 | | **5** | **1.1%** |
| Employees' capabilities | | | | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | **5** | **1.1%** |
| Facilities | 1 | | | 1 | | 3 | | **5** | **1.1%** |
| Partnerships | | | 1 | | | | 2 | **3** | **0.7%** |
| Programs offerings | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | | **3** | **0.7%** |
| Workforce and economic development (training; education; programs; support) | | | | | 2 | | | **2** | **0.4%** |
| College Connection on-site at the high school for all the steps of becoming a student in any IHE. | | | | | 1 | | | **1** | **0.2%** |
| Excessive number of projects/initiatives under limited resources | | 1 | | | | | | **1** | **0.2%** |
| High turn over of highly skilled/experienced employees | | | | | 1 | | | **1** | **0.2%** |
| Hiring at colleges | 1 | | | | | | | **1** | **0.2%** |
| Lacking policies on harrassment prevention other than sexual | 1 | | | | | | | **1** | **0.2%** |
| Low customer service from limited staff/resources | | | | | | 1 | | **1** | **0.2%** |
| None | | | | | 1 | | | **1** | **0.2%** |
| Parking | | | | | | | 1 | **1** | **0.2%** |
| Registration Process | 1 | | | | | | | **1** | **0.2%** |
| Too many initiatives at same time interfere with delivery of instruction | 1 | | | | | | | **1** | **0.2%** |
| | **75** | **26** | **48** | **63** | **63** | **165** | **19** | **459** | **100.0%** |

| OPPORTUNITIES | SAC | SPC | PAC | NVC | NLC | District | Students and Community | TOTAL | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Workforce needs (capitalize on workforce demands for emerging industry programs; trained/skilled workers by existing and incoming industries/companies) | 8 | 6 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 32 | 2 | **75** | **16.4%** |
| Annexation leading to increased enrollment and revenue | 15 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 15 | 23 | 3 | **69** | **15.1%** |
| Articulation agreements with four-year institutions | 7 | 2 | 7 | 14 | 7 | 18 | 7 | **62** | **13.5%** |
| Establish/strengthen partnerships | 7 | 5 | 8 | 6 | 5 | 19 | 6 | **56** | **12.2%** |
| Technology (demand for new technologies; distance education; etc.) | 5 | 1 | 7 | 8 | 10 | 23 | 2 | **56** | **12.2%** |
| Dual credit program revenue increase | 8 | 2 | | 5 | 3 | 7 | 1 | **26** | **5.7%** |
| Sustainability trends | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 10 | | **24** | **5.2%** |
| Demographic changes | 8 | | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | | **24** | **5.2%** |
| Slow economy prompting higher enrollments | 5 | | 1 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 1 | **19** | **4.1%** |
| Global initiatives | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 2 | **15** | **3.3%** |
| Socio-cultural changes | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 6 | | **14** | **3.1%** |
| Political changes | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 4 | | **13** | **2.8%** |
| Dual credit as a means of recruiting | | | | 1 | | | | **1** | **0.2%** |
| Pilots of innovative models like I-BEST and PASS that increase success for lower-skilled students | | | | | | 1 | | **1** | **0.2%** |
| Paradigm shift in teaching and learning taking place now | | | | | | 1 | | **1** | **0.2%** |
| Increased demand for affordability | | | | | | 1 | | **1** | **0.2%** |
| Offer independent mini prep programs that bridge the gap between highschool and college readiness. | | | | | 1 | | | **1** | **0.2%** |
| | **70** | **27** | **49** | **62** | **67** | **159** | **24** | **458** | **100.0%** |

| THREATS | SAC | SPC | PAC | NVC | NLC | District | Students and Community | TOTAL | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Funding reductions | 19 | 6 | 13 | 13 | 14 | 32 | 3 | **100** | **22.0%** |
| High school misalignment with colleges | 10 | 4 | 9 | 9 | 4 | 18 | 1 | **55** | **12.1%** |
| Student/citizen issues (poor preparation, illiteracy, LEP) | 12 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 14 | 3 | **47** | **10.3%** |
| Accountability requirements | 7 | | 4 | 4 | 6 | 17 | 1 | **39** | **8.6%** |
| Competition from other higher education institutions | 3 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 12 | 1 | **34** | **7.5%** |
| Economic downturn | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 10 | 4 | **27** | **5.9%** |
| Community's negative image about community colleges | | 1 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 1 | **20** | **4.4%** |
| Technology changes | 1 | | 4 | 2 | 2 | 9 | | **18** | **4.0%** |
| Political changes | 1 | | 3 | 3 | 2 | 8 | | **17** | **3.7%** |
| High school dropout rates | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | **15** | **3.3%** |
| Inflation/cost of living | 3 | | | 1 | 2 | 6 | 3 | **15** | **3.3%** |
| Community's disengagement/complacency | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 1 | **13** | **2.9%** |
| Accreditation requirements | | 1 | | 4 | 4 | 1 | | **10** | **2.2%** |
| Poverty | 2 | 1 | | 1 | | 4 | 2 | **10** | **2.2%** |
| Legal/regulatory changes | | 2 | | 3 | 1 | 1 | | **7** | **1.5%** |
| Demographic changes | 1 | | | | | 4 | | **5** | **1.1%** |
| Limited Nursing/Allied Health instructor availability | 4 | | 1 | | | | | **5** | **1.1%** |
| Globalization | | | | | 2 | 2 | | **4** | **0.9%** |
| Lawsuits and bad press | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | **4** | **0.9%** |
| Population growth | | | | 1 | 1 | 2 | | **4** | **0.9%** |
| Alternative energy issues | 1 | | | | | 1 | | **2** | **0.4%** |
| New federal financial aid regulations | | | 1 | | | | | **1** | **0.2%** |
| Online educational programs | | | | | | 1 | | **1** | **0.2%** |
| State measurement of performance based on faulty indicators | | | | | | 1 | | **1** | **0.2%** |
| MOOCs/Khan Academy | 1 | | | | | | | **1** | **0.2%** |
| | **73** | **25** | **49** | **66** | **65** | **155** | **22** | **455** | **100.0%** |

## **Appendix D.** Comments Provided by Responding Stakeholders

| Stakeholder Category | Campus | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Adjunct Faculty | NLC | As NLC seeks either a stand-alone institution or combination, the issue of how SACS affects them is important. Understanding that SACS is not quick to allow accreditation, it is vital that NLC does this once! What does SACS want? It is important to do this correct the first time so understanding what they want and how is key. Many high school students are still not ready for the rigor of college. They come into our classes with multiple college credits that don't reflect (many of them) true academic success! Being "passed on" and given college credit is a dis-service to them and to college professors who see them as not "qualified" to be in a "true" college setting with college expectation. It must get better. It seems that failing a HS student is unacceptable (and it certainly is) in that they should not be here or they must be better prepared to be here and therefore, succeed. |
| Adjunct Faculty | NLC | You talk a good game. You talk about the importance of adjuncts. It is not true and adjuncts know it. Adjuncts are important, but you take their classes and salary away to save money. |
| Adjunct Faculty | NVC | Don't sacrifice small classes because of the costs. Offer classes that students need regardless of minimum class sizes. Follow incremental analysis in determining class sizes. |
| Adjunct Faculty | PAC | High School Misalignments-Student poorly prepared to enter college or to even apply and read all the materials Technology Changes- No one can figure out Banner Policies and procedures are approved without thinking about the process. We make polices and then we have to backtrack. We had always asked students to provide with at least an unofficial transcript in order to enroll; then we ask for official transcript; then we figure no we need to give them a chance; for dual credit, for FTIC, for transfers in the summer we Ask for no college trans. For years we had operated on its better to have something than nothing. No we get nothing for transfer students; the disservice we are doing the student is outrageous is appalling; so I as an advisor just register a student coming from Texas State for the summer without asking for transcript I guess i don't need to care if the student was expelled for disciplinary issues or if he even completed the pre-req for the course he wants to take at Alamo Colleges, As a parent how would I be encouraged to send them here? |
| Adjunct Faculty | PAC | If you wish to continue implementing policies that are not assessed therefore we don't know if they are working and I guess we don't care as long as they are implemented then do everyone a favor and don't implement madness during the fall an or during a base year. How about you send a mass email letting employees know who is the leader for all these new procedures? MyMAP? GPS?, etc. It can't be possibly be the same person leading all these projects because if it is then shame on us for wanting one person to lead critical projects ; no wonder it feels like we are taking baby steps. |
| Full-Time Faculty | NVC | There is, of course, a balance that must be struck between costs and quality. However, we need to remember that affordability is only one half of the equation for value. |
| Full-Time Faculty | NVC | We undermine both academic and workforce programs when we approach hiring from a "minimum qualifications/floor" perspective, rather than from a "highest quality/ceiling" perspective. The former is driven by short-term financial concerns, but the latter produces a strong, quality-based foundation for long-term financial security. "Affordability" is only one half of the equation for value. |
| Full-Time Faculty | NVC | There are opportunities for both academic and workforce programs, if we invest in the quality of programs. "Affordability" is only one half of the equation for value. |
| Vice Chancellor or College President | District | Work at building trust among and between each other |
| College Staff or Administrator | District | Alamo Colleges is an open door for education but we need to maintain high educational standards |
| College Staff or Administrator | NLC | I think MyMAP is fantastic. It will provide great opportunities. The concept of steps of marketable skill - to - certificate - to - associate degree is brilliant. I think of the children book "The Little Engine That Could" with one track to the next track and beyond. |
| College Staff or Administrator | NLC | Overall a great place to work and grow. |
| College Staff or Administrator | NLC | The barriers imposed by Banner malfunctions as another add-on is loaded into the system. Is there any data to show how many students plan to attend but never finish the process? Where do they stop before taking the next step? |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| College Staff or Administrator | NLC | Join neighboring Chambers outside Bexar for the Chambers to rally for annexing. |
| College Staff or Administrator | NVC | We have a lot of different tools but they are not talking to each other. The new mobile app should be connected to Banner to be a true app. Our databases should be connected to Banner. Students should be able to update info themselves. WCMS and Digital signage should all work together. We have so few people and they manually update separate technologies. We're just not up to date on making all these technologies work together. |
| College Staff or Administrator | NVC | We have so many great systems and equipment but most of it is underutilized. We should invest in making our systems talk to each other. Simplify things for students and employees. Get rid of SharePoint and instead improve ACES. Use one portal. We have too many portals and systems to learn: ACES, Canvas, SharePoint, Web, Banner, etc. Who can keep track of this? Perfect one or two systems and make them work well for various audiences. |
| College Staff or Administrator | SAC | AC should continue efforts to equalize perspectives of & among staff and faculty employees. |
| College Staff or Administrator | SAC | High Schools and our District have not been willing to work out differences. New HS grads come here and find Math especially completely different in approach. This has been a multi decade problem and needs to be fixed now. |
| College Staff or Administrator | SAC | New rules about faculty in admin. positions is very short sighted and will greatly impact the willingness of faculty to move into admin. positions. Net result is that we will no longer grow our own admin. people out of the faculty ranks. Bad move. |
| College Staff or Administrator | SAC | Our administrators are spending too much time at District on multiple "initiatives". Because they are away or working on initiative issues too much, they are not able to attend to college issues, at a time when there are fewer staff to keep the home fires burning. Morale is still very low. New policies seem designed to lower morale further, by showing disrespect for employees. |
| College Staff or Administrator | SAC | We have a lot of potential to do more community outreach even though we already have a large number of current projects. |
| College Staff or Administrator | SAC | We need more/better counseling for the low-income, underprepared population we serve. That means more people in those roles. |
| College Staff or Administrator | SAC | We need to take the flexibility that is part of what we are to meet the dramatic changes that are impacting the delivery of education. |
| College Staff or Administrator | SAC | I know the communities that AC wants to get to annex pretty well in terms of Seguin and New Braunfels. It will not happen, given the culture/mindset of those people. |
| College Staff or Administrator | SPC | "Alamo Way" referred to sarcastically by colleges when problems arise or when disconnects or inconsistencies are evident |
| District Staff or Administrator | District | 1) Flatten the hierarchy to achieve greater productivity. 2) Eliminate Information Technology's king-of-the-hill arrogance to improve collaboration between business units. |
| District Staff or Administrator | District | Glad to be a part of Alamo Colleges, but tasked to implement innovative things without the "formal" pay-grade. |
| District Staff or Administrator | District | I often participate in surveys, however; the data isn't published. I am sometimes reluctant to speak freely for fear of retaliation from management. I don't want to feel this way and I am very uncomfortable with these processes. |
| District Staff or Administrator | District | In evaluating demographics, growth is occurring, but there is a disconnect between HS/colleges. Difficult to respond to growth when we are experiencing reductions in funding. |
| District Staff or Administrator | District | It seems as if Alamo Colleges pays a great deal to procure external instructional resources |
| District Staff or Administrator | District | Many upper-level supervisors/leaders do not have change leadership training so block their staff who have it from affecting change/breaking down silos, causing staff to fear trying to lead change. |
| District Staff or Administrator | District | Mid-level managers and their staff provide support and have huge responsibilities yet, there is very little employee engagement, support and feedback provided by the senior leadership such as AVC's and VC's. If there is a major threat, mid-level managers feel unsupported by their decisions; but since there is no feedback given, they are left to make decisions which affect the overall Alamo Colleges outcome. |
| District Staff or Administrator | District | MyMAP may be off to a rough start, but the concept is right. Providing a comprehensive system for students from start to finish, working with them to make sure they know what's required to achieve their goal is the right place for us to place our focus. That will help students succeed, which will increase our success points (funding). |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| District Staff or Administrator | District | Need to come to a better measure or public explanation of the success of students in community colleges |
| District Staff or Administrator | District | Need to evaluate the high paying upper management. This can be reduced to save money. |
| District Staff or Administrator | District | The Texas community colleges need to get the state to pay their portion of the TRS contributions. The non-payment by both the colleges and the State will (and perhaps already has) hurt the retirement benefits of TRS employees. There seems to be no urgency because no one is complaining. |
| District Staff or Administrator | District | We are moving in the right direction. Leadership at all levels need to improve their people skills (emotional intelligence), embrace change and inspire their employees. |
| District Staff or Administrator | District | We have to keep working on becoming one strong education institution in the market place, a competitive force to be reckoned. Together we are so much stronger. |
| District Staff or Administrator | District | We need community forums with our leadership (off campus) to hear what we can do better. |
| District Staff or Administrator | District | How students expect to learn - via blended online and classroom sessions, flipped classrooms, social media, global classrooms, leveraging MOOCs are all critical for Alamo Colleges to master and shape the changes now, on the front end of the change, not following the trends set by others. Its' going to happen with us or without us. |
| District Staff or Administrator | District | Other: increased demand for affordability of college education |
| District Staff or Administrator | District | We must continue to boost the completion/ success agenda for DE students especially the lower skilled. Our completion rates are dismal and by the numbers, DE is our main business. |
| District Staff or Administrator | District | Operationally, it is difficult to provide the level of service we would like to, with our limited staff. We need time to get the bus in order before we pick up additional passengers (students and initiatives), all while trying to change the tires. |
| District Staff or Administrator | NLC | There are more and more online programs that offer self-paced completion programs. The AC District could offer exclusive online versions of our two-year degree and certificate programs. |
| District Staff or Administrator | NLC | Be innovative in developing and offering one of the first online two-year programs that would offer the same competitive rates. It could at least be initially operated as a district with profits divied among the colleges. |
| Student | PAC | One of the primary threats to community colleges is there is a significant misrepresentation of community college value as an institution. As a student, I always saw community college as an option for students that had nowhere better to go. Community college was a last ditch option for "losers". One of the primary ways for community colleges to survive is to boost enrollment. With funding reductions revenue will have to be found elsewhere in order to stave off increases in tuition costs. Community colleges will have to start marketing themselves like four year universities or face the continuing destructive misconception that community colleges should be your last choice. |
| Student | PAC | As a student, seeking a cost effective debt free path to my bachelor's degree. If there is one main selling point about community colleges is the articulation plan. Because of the articulation plan I will have only $20,000 dollars left to be paid for after I earn my degree. Establishing and strengthening partnerships is the only way to survive in this current failing economy. Only by maximizing, efficiently allocating, and sharing mutual resources while fulfilling mutual needs will the Alamo colleges be able to survive. All stakeholders: faculty, employees, students, and community members must unite in a common movement. Finally, the market and areas of governance are becoming increasingly global and intertwined. Only by tapping the global movement in industry and government in the way we focus education will San Antonio, Texas, and the United States stay at the forefront of development. |
| Student | SAC | At one time financial aid covered cost of school, books, supplies and basic living at a University (my brother did this in the 70's). Now financial aid is considerably less requiring loans and that barely covers Jr. College let alone a University. The cost of living, tuition, and lack of jobs are stressful on success with studies in school. I myself could do better in school but my time at work makes it hard. The limited amount of spaces in Allied Health Program along with the increase of students trying to get into these programs is not balanced. I think this could be due to the amount of teachers available to instruct in these programs. |
| Student | SAC | Classes offered at Jr. College don't match requirements at 4-yr University. When waiting to be accepted in a program like Allied Health, student should be able to work on another plan (plan B) till requirements are accepted with first plan. Higher enrollments and fewer teachers are the cause for many programs being filled and require a separate plan. |
| Community Member | NLC | Work with State legislative bodies to ensure educational cuts are not made and that former revenues are restored. |